THE

MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. V.] BOSTON, JUNE, 1864. [No. 6.

THIS LIFE AND THE NEXT.

(THEIR RELATION.)

BY THOMAS STARR KING.

[The following excellent tract was published in Albany, by the Ladies' Religious Publication Society, in 1859. It seems to us desirable to reprint, and we have no doubt our readers will be pleased to see it. Those who have read it before will like to have it again; and those who have not will be glad of the opportunity. — EDITOR.]

"But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal." — MATT. vi. 20.

WHAT is the connection between this life and the life beyond the grave? In what relation does a pure and wise religion — in what relation does Christianity, properly interpreted — set the opportunities and discipline of this world and the life hereafter? This is the question we purpose to consider now. On this subject there are broad and vital differences between the Orthodox theologies of Christendom and the conceptions that are justified by the principles of Liberal Christianity.

This is, in fact, one of the most important questions involved in the wide discussion between the two schools of

religious thought. The health of the religious sentiment itself; the breadth of our view of God's providence; the proper methods of enlightening and training the spiritual faculties; indeed, the great questions of what religion is for, and how it works in the character and in the world, — all these are involved in a correct estimate of the relation of this life to the life immortal.

Take notice that it is not the subject of *Retribution* which is to be put in the foreground. The matter and methods of retribution will be to some extent involved; but the point which stands out in relief before us here is, What is the purpose of this life, in the moral government of God, considered in connection with the disembodied life, that we believe will never end? Or rather, more definitely, which, of two conceptions that are inharmonious and hostile, is correct?

According to the evangelical Orthodox theology, this life is a *final* state of probation for a fixed destiny in the world to come. By the appointment of God, a definite and arbitrary doom awaits every soul at its entrance into the spiritual world, if it has not complied here with the conditions of salvation. This doom is something very different from the natural workings of sin in the moral and religious constitution. It is a *penalty* affixed by the pleasure of God, and forced upon the soul by his power, at the day of judgment, — just as incarceration in a dungeon, or torture upon the rack, are penalties totally different from, and additional to, the natural consequences of doing wrong, that are ordained by the laws of our frame or of our moral nature.

The Almighty governs men here, it is confessed, in large measure, by forces that work within every bosom. The good man is rewarded by peace of conscience, by the satisfactions of service, by the richer glow and altered look

of the world, by blessed habits of obedience that bring the consciousness of freedom, by the deepening sense of the nearness and friendship of the Infinite. The bad man is punished here, it is allowed, in a large measure, by the clogging of his nobler nature; by the frequent unrest of conscience; by deadness to inspiring truth and sacred joys; by the depraved quality of his life, even though he may not be conscious of its vileness; by his alienation from Infinite Purity and Love. But a very different method of government, according to the creeds, is to commence on the other side of the grave. Then the accepted souls are to be lifted to a heaven where there is to be no more moral trial; and the rejected souls are banished to a pit, where the only experience, through eternity, will be that of woe, — woe inflicted by the power of the omnipotent and offended God.

In this world, the opportunity of repentance is always offered. So long as we are this side of the tomb, there is nothing which God desires more than the penitent confession of a soul that has been disloyal. He will answer its prayer for mercy here, lend his Spirit to assist its aspiration, and pardon its offences on the ground of Christ's atonement. Even on the death-bed, he will listen to the contrite petition that is lisped in the name of Jesus. He will pardon years of monstrous guilt for one dying hour of repentant agony, in which the soul casts itself and all its hideous misdeeds upon the mercy and merits of the Redeemer; but when the eyelids close, and the lips are cold, and the earthly history is sealed, the ear of God is deaf to every cry of contrition, — the heart of God is destitute of any throb of pity. No repentance, no prayer, no desire to return to the service of righteousness, no cry of anguish, will then stir the heavens with sympathy. Mercy stops at the grave.

Such is the relation, according to the popular faith, of this life to the next. God is different there from his revelation of himself here. The laws of life are different. Christ is different. He is a Redeemer here, an Avenger there. The few years of our responsible life here — passed, too, under the pressure of a depraved nature and hostile circumstances — are the teeth of a tiny cog-wheel, and they set in motion the awful sweep of an eternal destiny.

You will see at once how this conception must affect the estimate of life, and of the office of religion as related to life. How pale it makes all ordinary concerns and duties look! What slight interest it inspires in the religious sentiment and Christian principles, as the strengthening and mellowing forces of a calm, deep, and sweet character, and the leaven of a noble society and an advancing civilization! It sets this life, and all the concerns of it, and all its laws, in sharp and dramatic contrast with eternity. It throws across this world the wide shadow of the judgment throne. It makes the eloquence of the Church converge into one burning question, — "Are you safe? have you an interest in Christ? will you comply with the terms of mercy while the short season of mercy lasts?" It makes labor for the rescue of souls from the impending and irremediable woe of eternity the one consummate duty of all Christians. It does not stimulate the Church to preach God as the patron of all goodness, and so to make integrity in business, regard for the interests of others, a noble use of power, consecration of money, sweetness of temper, cordiality of friendship, interest in all movements that promise to bless men more richly in this world, and the effort to instil high principles and trust in God by slow domestic nurture, the steady and satisfactory and indispensable signs of religious soundness and the divine

blessing. But it makes the highest Christian service consist in winning people to a technical experience that protects them against the perils that lower over the entrance to the eternal world; and it divides goodness into two distinct grades, — ecclesiastical and natural, — putting the ecclesiastical kind far above the natural. It leads men to estimate certain emotions as more savory and acceptable to God than steadfast principles which are not associated with such emotions; to feel that a public prayer of three minutes for the descent of the Holy Spirit, or an exhortation to come to Christ, is of more account, as a sign of the soul's soundness, than an hour of honorable traffic, though the man puts by a temptation to a slight falsehood which would have increased his profit; to believe that a public confession that one is a sinner, and can only be saved through the merits of Christ, is a clearer proof of spirituality than a silent curb every day on a base passion or a runaway tongue, if it is unconnected with such a confession; to feel that a donation of fifty dollars to the Foreign Mission Society is accounted of more worth in heaven than a hundred dollars devoted to the poor within a quarter of a mile; to think that God regards what is consecrated to extend the Church as a far surer sign of sanctity than what is given outside the immediate patronage of the Church to support truth, and befriend the afflicted, and open new resources for the better nature of men.

Of course, I do not mean to say that the believers in this evangelical theory of this life are never, or are very slightly, interested in good causes and good works that are independent of church interests. I do not mean, either, to imply or to hint that spiritual emotions and prayers, and ardent desires that others shall become Christians, are not excellent and indispensable qualities and exercises of a broad and ripe Christian character. They are noble and

blessed, as all openness to the Infinite in the soul is precious; but they are no better, because they are distinctively qualities that are exhibited within church enclosures, than qualities are which are shown only in the market, or at home, or are hidden in the bosom. They are no better and no more acceptable to God because they are emotions than integrity and honor and unflinching veracity are which are shown in acts. Certainly they are no more lovely and sacred, and under the patronage of Heaven, because they clothe themselves in the dress of the most devout language, than desires to enthrone justice and to assist the destitute are, because they are expressed in a vote, or in writing the leader of a newspaper, or in subscribing the circulars of a board of charity.

God, the Perfect Good, the Infinite Goodness, is the patron of all righteousness. He asks for all kinds of excellence, — for emotions and acts, for prayers and character, for the labor that extends religious truth and secular good. He does not rate ecclesiastical service any higher than loyalty outside church-lines. Can you suppose that the Ineffable Equity listens with more joy to the prayers and hymns of a conference-meeting than to the electric applause of a noble caucus, when a thousand souls respond to the denunciation of the tyranny of a president, or vow fidelity to the cause of an abused race, in spite of the scorn of a court? Do you suppose that fifty dollars on a Presbyterian subscription-paper, to send the gospel to the heathen, looks any more eloquent in heaven than the same money pledged to buy her daughter for a poor black woman from the clutch of an American slave-trader? All unselfish service for humanity, all sincere prayers and hymns and toil, are welcome to the Infinite Father, and are accounted part of the forces of the Church of Christ.

The theory of evangelical Orthodoxy makes this life

seem so dark under the awful perils of the near eternity, that the effort to get souls safe by intense assault is considered its distinctive call, and not the more broad and equable labor to nurture character, and to pour by steady influx the forces of a pure civilization into the world. Although multitudes of the best preachers and disciples of the theory are broader in their vision and fidelity, and practical conception of life, than the creed warrants, still the pressure of the system is always felt in some degree; and, in times when the Church is said to awake, — in all revival seasons, — the theory blazes forth with intenser heat: for then the great question flames out on all sides, not primarily, How can trade be made less selfish, and homes more happy, and politics more loyal, and laws more just, and the Holy Spirit — the very breath and life of God — be instituted more widely in society? but rather, How many souls can be won over to secure an interest in Christ? How can men be made to fear the coming judgment? What numbers can be wrought upon by exhortation and prayer to fly to the ark of safety, prepare for the deathbed, and make ready for the great assize which shall settle for ever their destiny?

The Christians who accept the evangelical conception of the relation of this life and the next are not wrong in bending their energies thus to the work of filling the churches, and securing as many as possible from future doom. It is not *them* we criticise: it is *the theory* which works through them, and to which they are loyal. We wonder that they pay so much attention as they do to the affairs of this world outside the Church. We wonder that they take any commanding interest in human government, in civilization, in benevolent enterprises that are secular, in politics, in provident associations, in temperance movements, in schools and asylums. If I were a fervent

believer in the "evangelical" theory of this life, I do not see how I could give any money, though I were as rich as Crœsus, to purchase a slave's liberty, or found a hospital for the blind, or build a model lodging-house, or establish an evening school, or rear a free library; no, nor even to send missionaries ten thousand miles to the heathen of the antipodes. Of what account is ignorance or bondage or blindness or hunger, in comparison with the peril of everlasting darkness, slavery, and want? "How can you ask me," I should say, "to weaken my purse for mere secular benefits, how can you even ask me to waste the precious gold in the long voyages of missionaries, when all that can be gathered of it is so trifling as an implement to arouse men to their danger; to waken the heathen that speak our own tongue, and can be counted by tens of thousands around us; to keep the fog-bell of the Church pealing the solemn and continual alarm to the myriads that are rushing thoughtlessly through the mists of the senses, to be wrecked on the breakers of death?" Let tyranny and all secular wrong run riot on the planet, undisturbed by the Church, if only she can rescue the more from that doom whose horror makes all earthly misery and injustice look utterly insignificant. Dr. Brownson was right, according to the theory of life which Catholics and Orthodox hold in common, when he said that Ireland was in far better condition than New England: for her squalid millions — the very Lazarus of nations — were within the pale of the true Church, and sure of the beatific vision; while the well-fed, cultured, and wealthy Protestants of New England will find small comfort in the eternal prison-house from the memory of their free schools and ballot-boxes and fine houses and private judgments on earth. On the theory of Calvinism, we have always felt that Dr. Nehemiah Adams's "South-side View of Slavery," and the

non-interference of the Tract Society with slavery, are justifiable and consistent. On "evangelical" grounds, we believe that Dr. Adams can defend himself fairly against Dr. Cheever.

We must utterly put away the notion that this life — so short, so treacherous, so unequal in its conditions — is our *final* state of probation. Until we do this; until we adopt the highest liberal Christian conception of its purpose, and its ties to the future, — we cannot hold a worthy conception of the character of the Infinite Father; we cannot estimate properly the breadth of the purpose and plan of Christianity; we cannot feel the inmost sanctions of duty; we cannot work wisely, steadily, and with peaceful hearts, for the good of man and the glory of God.

We are not placed here, corrupt in our very constitution, to prepare for a judgment that will decide our destiny for ever, by a fiat of Omnipotence. Man was made to be a recipient of the divine life. We are here to rise by all our faculties to the knowledge of God, the Infinite Father; to an acquaintance with his wisdom by our intellect; with his art by our love of beauty; with his law and justice by our conscience; with his very personal life and love by our finest spiritual sensibilities; and to be co-workers with him, to know something of his joy, to be a child of his adoption, a joint-heir with Christ, and not simply a creature of his power, by our consecrated will.

On every one of our distinguishing faculties there is the stamp of a great future, the possibility of unending growth, the signet of immortality. This world is simply the threshold of our vast life, the first stepping-stone from nonentity into the boundless expanse of possibility. We commence our career here, sheathed in fleshly bodies, to take our first look, through senses, of the riches of infinite thought; to learn the alphabet of the unsearchable wisdom; to get

our eyes trained, little by little, through these physical screens, to see and bear the light of the infinite glory. This world is the infant-school of the soul; and the universe, as spread out before our mortal eyes, — the physical universe, and the spiritual trials and mysteries of our discipline, — is simply our primer, our grammar, our spelling-dictionary, to teach us something of the language we are to wield in our maturity. An unbounded future; a future unfettered by any arbitrary judgments and judicial wrath of God; a future ruled by sleepless and perfect laws, of which we are to learn something here; a future for stern and beneficent education and training, — such is the vista in which we are to look from this pebble of a planet, such is the scale on which we are to project our life, such is the light in which we are to study the character of God and the meaning of Christianity.

This life our final state of probation! No opportunity for moral change, for profiting by experience, for spiritual consecration and growth, in the unwasting ages of the life to come! Think of God creating an *infinite capacity*, and affixing this law to it, — that, if it does not develop to a certain degree in thirty years, it shall be prohibited from making any advance afterwards; it shall be arrested by his hand; every stirring and throb of life shall be checked; and it shall for ever be kept in misery, too, for its failure to grow during those few years of trial, — infinitely less in comparison with its whole career than a second is contrasted with a life of seventy years! Think of the Infinite Reason ordaining such a government as that! Think of the Infinite Father establishing and sustaining such a rule!

Look at the idea in the light of an illustration. Suppose that three boys — a young Beethoven, a young Newton, a young Raffaelle — were placed in a thoroughly

appointed university, and, because they refused to study during the first hour, — were even deliberately disobedient and idle, we will say, — should be miraculously removed from it by the Infinite Intellect, and immured in a dungeon near those grounds. Soon they see their folly; they feel their ingratitude: the thirst for knowledge, a sense of the unspeakable glory of wisdom, a desire to learn and publish the charm and mysteries of truth, loveliness, and melody, stirs in their bosoms. They pledge themselves wisely and reverently to the objects for which the university was reared. They pray for release, that their faculties may be consecrated. But no: for that first hour of idleness, they are told that they are never to be permitted to study. No light shall visit them; no beauty shall be revealed to them; no starry wonders shall tempt their reason; no instruments shall provoke their genius for music. The Infinite Reason forbids them ever to learn, or to develop their glorious capacities. To all eternity they are to be kept in that dungeon, willing to study, praying to be allowed to study, burning with the agony of straitened faculties, prevented from dying, — all to illustrate the equity of the Creative Mind, who, of his own pleasure, affixed that penalty to the wandering thought and mental unfaithfulness of the first hour!

Say nothing now of justice. Can you conceive of the Infinite *Intellect* forbidding a finite mind to learn, if it desires to learn, because it was once false to its own law? Can you conceive of God interfering by his power to debar a mind from the acquisition of some of his profuse and opulent truth? You can conceive of a mind injuring its own quality, greatly damaging it, by laziness and immethodical habits, and continued violations of its inwrought laws; but when, through a bitter experience of this waste and wrong, it desires to be loyal again, and

begins to be, can you conceive of the *Creator*, the *Perfect Intelligence*, doing any thing else than offering it welcome to the whole wealth of his truth, and feeling joy in finding a new channel for his wisdom? And can you think of *Infinite Love* arbitrarily restraining a soul from rising nearer to him; from flying to him with a penitent prayer; from consecrating itself to his service, — forbidding this throughout eternity on account of its unconsecration and misuse of time in its short hour of earthly experience? The question between "evangelical" and "liberal" Christianity is, not whether a soul shall not be thoroughly punished, fearfully punished, for evil; nay, the question is not, whether a soul may not *choose* to live away from God, and true life, and substantial joy, for ever; but this is the question: "If a soul is penitent, desires to return, is willing and anxious to be a recipient of the Divine Life, and his child, will God arbitrarily and for ever prevent it, having fixed its doom at the day of judgment?" Orthodoxy says, "Yes." Liberal Christianity says, "This is blasphemy against the Infinite." It affirms that there will never be any barrier between the Infinite Love and a human soul but that soul's own alienation; and it declares with emphasis and joy, against every form of Orthodoxy, that there will never be a moment in eternity when it will not be the desire of the Infinite, and for the interests of the universe too, that the alienation of a darkened spirit should cease.

But it may be asked, "Is not the transfer from this world to the eternal world a most important and solemn thing? Is not this life, after all, in some way, a probation for the life to come? Is not death a most momentous crisis in our history?" Yes, I answer, rightly understood, death is a momentous crisis in our experience; yet not by reversing or annulling the laws under which the soul

lives here, but by giving them freer scope; not by sweeping sinful souls under one arbitrary judgment of God that for ever arrests the possibility of spiritual revival and growth, but by delivering them over to the unembarrassed action of principles that infold our life here, that rule through the whole spiritual universe, and that continually reveal the providence and justice, and perfect goodness too, of the Infinite Lord.

Let us not fail to see that this world is a state of probation or trial for the next, just as all life is preparation and probation for all coming life; and the entrance into the next state is a crisis or judgment-time in our career, on the same principle that makes youth a crisis-season to show what has been our training and fidelity in boyhood, or manhood to reveal what has been the experience of youth, or old age to test the resources and reveal the principles gained and cherished in the preceding years. The laws are solemn enough, the retributions are serious enough, without adding the dreadful and foolish assertion, that God will forbid us ever to change, — ever to be any better, — ever to make any effort to throw off our chains, and rise nearer to him.

We were born into this universe to be educated; to become acquainted with the glory of God, and receive his life, and rise into the service and fellowship of his holy will. In this state, we are spirits clad in bodies, and beginning our relations to the Infinite Spirit and Will partly through bodies. We do not go into the eternal world, at death, for the *first* time. We are in the eternal world *now*, and in the world of time and matter also. Our souls are dealing with spiritual principles and with God, as well as with outward things and cares, *every day*. We are half in the eternal world when we are on Wall Street or Broadway, when we sit in the

Legislature, when we are at our toil, when we return to our homes: that is, our souls have certain relations to justice; our minds are awake or indifferent to Infinite Truth; our active powers are dedicated or disloyal to the Infinite Love; our affections are deep and pure, or foul and shallow; we have resources and joys flowing through our duties, and through this visible world, directly from the Infinite, or we are destitute of them. Now, when we die, we pass further into the spiritual world. We pass entirely out of Wall Street, out of the bank, out of the strife of politics, out of the store, out of the home, out of the flesh, into the realm of pure truth and reality. The shell drops away, and we are face to face with the substance. The transparency that veiled and colored the light has shrivelled, and we are in the full day; we are there with our minds, will, affections, hearts, in certain states of fitness or unfitness for that which is always the real work of a human being; we are there with the central powers of our humanity strong or weak by training or abuse here; we are there with souls in harmony or at discord with the law and love of heaven.

Religion usually asks, "Are you prepared for death? Have you an interest in Christ? Are you at peace with the Holy Spirit, so that you can be protected at the last judgment?" The question with regard to the next world really is, "Are you prepared for life? Have you been so quickened by Christ, are you so receptive of the Spirit, have you so faithfully used this world, that you can go into a world where the only resources are those of your humanity, love of truth, delight in the beauty which God reveals, service of his will, joy in the reception of his life?"

The great crisis of death is, that we pass more intensely into life, and show our fitness for it. The sadness and ter-

ror of misusing this world lie in the waste of faculty, or the degradation of faculty, which sin and sloth and disloyalty produce. On this ground, the danger of low living here cannot be overrated.

You see a young man squandering his time and slighting all his privileges in the university where his father has placed him. You know that he is to obtain his living by a profession for which the university supplies the substantial training; and when you see him neglecting his mental fibres, allowing his mind to dissipate its powers, forming no habits of application and labor, laying up no resources, devoting the precious hours to listless or guilty enjoyment, you say, that, while the young man is punished continually by the kind of career he is leading, he is moving on to a crisis-season, — to a judgment-time that opens when he passes from the great school to the work of life. He goes then into the sphere where he must depend on his own treasury of powers. He goes into competition with men who have been faithful to their season of privilege. He goes where laziness brings penury; where base enjoyments are stricken from him; where there is a demand, every day, for the developed powers that he ought to have carried with him from the classes and studies of the college. There is no arbitrary doom, no definite and irreversible penalty, executed upon him by the fiat of Providence. He is not pressed into a visible hell of the mind or of society. There is no decree over him that he cannot repent of his folly, and begin anew to study, to aspire, and to obey the laws of his constitution.

And yet how terrible his punishment is! The forces of the world around him are all friendly to a disciplined and healthy mind; but he is out of tune with them. He must begin anew. He must begin, as a man, to learn what

he should have learned as a boy. He must uncoil habits with one hand, and apply the other to work which might have been done years before. He must *undo*, at bitter cost, every particle of the miserable work which idleness and faithlessness had wrought in his constitution. He must come into harmony with himself and his sphere of duty, before he can get a jot of the good which overflows at the bidding of Providence into every heart that is prepared for life.

RELIGIOUS "PERFORMANCES."

I AM disturbed by the announcement that "divine service will be *performed*." It suggests that a prayer will be "made," a sermon "pronounced," and some music "artistically rendered" by a pyrotechnic quartette, in the presence of an appreciative "audience," whose "part" (if the cast of the play includes the people in the pews) it will be to join in "reciting" a litany.

Perhaps I am a Quaker, and something more. "The Spirit giveth life;" and life is the main thing. With life comes peace and power and progress.

"But shall we not have forms?" Yes, if we have life, it will be sure to manifest itself; and the manifestation of life will always be in some form or other. Never trouble yourself about the forms, but seek first, last, and always, for *life*, and all other things shall be added. I only pray that we may have *life*, and that we may have it more abundantly. This is the one thing needful for all our churches. We have machinery enough: the power to drive it must come into our souls from God out of heaven. All the form we have without life is only so much more death.

But only the Spirit giveth life. (I mean *the* Spirit, with a capital S.) Many a man and many a church may

have put life into a form: but neither man nor church ever got life out of a form; for a form has no life to give.

If there are those who defend rites and ordinances as positive commandments, — given as tests of obedience, resting on no basis of perceived fitness, springing from no felt necessity, demanded by no appetite of the soul, but required by some arbitrary divine word which says, "Obey, and ask no questions," — to such I say, Go your ways in peace; eat your celestial saw-dust; make no wry faces, if you can help it; pronounce it manna, and be blessed. Have I not also fed on the same, and found life in spite of it?

If for babes in soul it is necessary that they should steady themselves in part, while learning to walk, by taking hold of some ordinance or rite or form; or if some of the family are weak, and can walk better by the help of crutches, — let us even join them in thanking God for the strength which is made perfect in weakness, and let them know how rejoicingly they are welcomed as fellow-travellers Zionward. It still remains true, that no crutch gives strength, though weakness may lean upon it, and, while leaning, may receive strength. Legs and feet, in good running order, are better, for all that; and, for those who can use them, they are an all-sufficient "ordinance," of the very divinest divine appointment. Happy the child who has outgrown leading-strings, and who can balance himself without a chair! Happy the man who is independent of a crutch! Oh for the great word of faith which shall touch all that limp and stumble, so that their feet and ankle-bones may receive strength! How should we see and hear them in all our temples, passing through many a gate that is "Beautiful," walking and leaping, and praising God! Let us beware that we indulge no worse sentiment than pity for those who insist that there can be no divine order, unless we all keep step with those who hobble or

fall down in a uniformity of creeping. If cripples are in a majority, I suppose the party which prefers to go on its muscle may find itself voted "outside of all healthy organization;" but not the less should we pray and exercise to become strong in the Lord and in the power of his might.

But forms give no strength. If there should seem to be a sense in which this is not wholly true, that is precisely the sense in which I wish to affirm it as *most* true; and should a thousand dear and devout brethren and sisters in the precious faith declare that their experience contradicts this, then I must make so bold as to contradict, if not their experience, at least their way of reporting it. Confronting them in love, I must say, No: you have received life while using forms, and sometimes in spite of forms, but never *from* forms.

Do they still insist that outward forms are the channels through which grace flows to the soul? Again I dogmatize: The forms which serve as channels of spiritual good are themselves spiritual and interior: heavenly grace flows into the soul through true thoughts, right feelings, and especially through that *right willing* which leads to the manifestation of the grace in right action.

"Ah, indeed! here is the very argument for forms: they suggest right thoughts, excite right feelings, and so strengthen the right purpose which leads to right action." I answer, That result comes unsought: sought, it flies. The moment you begin to *depend* upon forms, even for this secondary effect; the moment you begin to say, "I will submit myself to the influence of such and such a form, that I may *thereby* be lifted into a higher frame and a truer life,"—that moment you begin to lose your soul. The form becomes then, to some extent, an object of faith; it assumes a false sacredness; it is an idol,—the more

beautiful, the more hideous: it is truer devotion to spurn it with the foot than to bend the knee before it. The man who makes long prayers, thinking he shall be heard for his much speaking, is trusting to his prayers more than to the goodness of God. The more he prays, the more impious he grows. True, he cultivates his reverence, but misdirects it; he develops faith, but it passes straightway into superstition. Equally so with all who trust to find religious efficacy in a baptism, a sacrament, or any possible "observance." Even in respect to prayer, it is better not to speak a word than to pray downward into Pharisaism. The soul's unspoken trust in God, —

> "No wish conceived, no thought expressed, —
> Only a sense of supplication," —

is itself both prayer and answer. He who, having this spirit, deems it *necessary* to frame his desire into language, and gives himself the credit of having prayed, merely *because* he has so framed it, is in mortal peril of murdering his prayer altogether. I aim this shaft, not against the verbal prayer which the soul pours out "with strong crying" or in "low breathings," but against the prayers which are only *said*.

Herein lies the folly and the danger of all human contrivances to invigorate worship. They are meant well; but they fail, and turn to positive mischief, because the tide of attention will set toward the artificial sign rather than toward the thing meant to be signified. And so worship becomes debased and unsouled. "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" asked Paul of converted Jews in Galatia, who imagined Christianity would be the more wholesome, and the more easily preserved and propagated, for a slight infusion of the old ceremonial element. There is a powerful and perpetual

tendency to substitute the outward and formal for the inward and spiritual. Men go through the motions, and complacently think they have worshipped God. Those who are already spiritual-minded *will* worship him with or without the system of motions; but whoever furnishes to an unspiritual people a seemingly religious *routine* has only given them facilities for self-deception, — setting them in easy grooves for running still further away from God.

Of course, these remarks apply only to those forms which are invented and employed to generate or "get up" religious feeling, and which are therefore sure to be more or less depended on for that purpose. The objections — both fatal — are, 1st, That such forms do not and cannot produce true religious feeling in unspiritual minds; and, 2d, That they needlessly facilitate hypocrisy and self-deception, by enabling those to *appear* religious who are not so, as well as by enabling those who have but little religious feeling to profess more than they possess.

There are similar if not equally strong objections to the use of fixed and stated forms for the expression of that degree of religious feeling which really exists. I fear no extended liturgy is possible which will not in a little time slide into a method of drawing nigh unto God with the mouth, and honoring him with the lips, while the heart is far from him. I say, "no *extended* liturgy," because it does not seem likely that the use of the Lord's Prayer, or the alternate reading of a few Scripture sentences by minister and people, any more than the reading of a chapter by the children at the fireside, can ever precipitate a congregation into formalism. But — I cannot put it too strongly — better no word-worship, no worship at all, than false worship. Better Friend-like silence than heartless clatter. "It is true that I swear, and you pray; but then, you know, neither of us *mean* any thing by it," was

the profane man's good-humored retort to the deacon's reproof. In that case, I must count the deacon the profaner man of the two. Alas for both! An unmeaning use of the Great Name proclaims an unmeaning life, a poverty-stricken soul.

The essence of worship — all that can make it profitable to man, or in any sense acceptable to Heaven — is "truth in the inward parts." For Heaven's sake, and for our own souls' sake, let us admit no taint of insincerity; let us open no door to pretence.

Least of all is this tolerable or excusable in the churches which assume to be Liberal; since their claim to liberalness can only be supported on the ground that they are themselves liberated from the bondage of the dead letter, and brought into the freedom of the living spirit. How shall we drown the distracting jargon of "Lo here," and "Lo there," with our clear testimony, "The kingdom of God is within you," if we ourselves are looking that it should come "with observation" or through observances? Once having heard the Sacred Voice in the soul, how can we turn again to the weak and beggarly elements whereunto so many desire to be in bondage? While bewildered multitudes are seeking vainly for the true religion, the true salvation, the true Christ, and the true heaven, in creeds, authorities, ordinances, churches, sabbaths, sacraments, sanctuaries, Bibles, and the saying of prayers, — as though these could give life, — what do we more than others, what do we but add to the Babel of noises, if we can only say, "See! here is more of the same sort; here are improved models of the same machines for grinding out faith and worship: we offer you another set of forms; we issue an improved edition of the Gospel of Outwardness"? What is this but a repetition of the old folly, which exposes us to the rebuke, "Ye have forsaken me, the

Fountain of living waters, and hewn out to yourselves cisterns, broken cisterns, which can hold no water"?

I speak out of a happy faith that God has provided some better thing for us. Let us walk in the Spirit, and be content to trust its guidance; then we shall have forms enough, and they will be full of light and power. Let us conform to the beautiful order of Nature, which yields to the plastic life, so that her outward seemings continually change, as the deep causes change, robing her with ever-varying glories. So far as we may, let us speak and pray as the Spirit gives utterance, trusting much to inspiration, and inviting more of it by our faithfulness. Oh! if the freshness, liveliness, spontaneousness, and enterprise of early Methodism, unmarred by its errors, *could* but enter into the life of our Liberal churches! if we *could* but have a system of meetings in which the religious feeling could pour itself through the social nature, so that the word of the Lord could have free course and be glorified among us! if we *could* thus call into exercise the varied and beautiful gifts which slumber now! if we *could* but believe that it is safe to let the gentle inward constraining have its way, and so *abandon* ourselves to that liberty which is the highest law! Ah, "would God all the Lord's people were prophets!"

I roll as a sweet morsel under my tongue the phrase of James Martineau, — "Christianity without priest and without ritual;" and Channing's saying, — "I find the true altar, the sweet incense, the accepted priest, in all sanctified souls;" and his exhortation at the dedication of Newport Church, — "To you, Christianity is wholly a spiritual system. Let not this house be desecrated by a religion of show; let it not degenerate into a place of forms; let not your pews be occupied by lifeless machines; do not come here to take part in lethargic repetition of sacred words;"

and the brave word of Paul which lifted Christianity out of Judaism into universality, — "Why are ye yet subject to ordinances? If ye are led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law;" best of all, and the conclusion of the whole matter, — "God is a Spirit, and they that worship must worship in spirit and in truth."

And now let us all join, as I feel we are all moved to do, in asking that most needed blessing upon our hearts and our churches, upon our ministers and people, — the descending Life! Let us together sing and pray, in willing concert of aspiration with the devout of every name, —

"Come, Holy Spirit, heavenly Dove,
With all thy quickening powers;
Come, shed abroad a Saviour's love,
And that shall kindle ours."

ORTHODOX ASSURANCE.

The history of the last year in England and France contains singular evidence of the shifts to which intolerance and fear are ready to resort, that heresy and free thought may be put down. Yet in all the folly of the Consistory of Paris, or the Convocations of Oxford, there is nothing to match in its absurdity an article which the editors of the "Boston Review" have admitted without protest into the May number of their periodical. Will it be believed, that a respectable theological work, after all that has been written by critics and scholars, actually has the assurance to come forward, and assert that the text of the "Three Heavenly Witnesses," in 1 John v. 7, is genuine, and a part of the original Epistle? The audacity of such an assertion is remarkable, even in so orthodox a Review. Why, if there is any critical question concerning the text

of the New Testament settled beyond doubt or dispute; if there is any point of textual reading on which all respectable students of the New Testament, German and English, High Church and Low Church, Anglican or Dissenter, are agreed, — it is this, that 1 John v. 7 has not the shadow of a title to be considered genuine. One paragraph from Alford disposes of the question in such an absolute fashion as would seem to leave not an inch of ground for the strictest worshipper of the letter to stand upon in defending the passage. The editors of the Review are candid enough to give that passage; but they are not candid enough to say whether they accept its conclusion.

Dean Alford remarks that the passage is "omitted in all the Greek manuscripts previous to the beginning of the sixteenth century; all the Greek fathers, even when producing texts in support of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; all the ancient versions, including the Vulgate, as it came from Jerome; and many Latin fathers." And his conclusion is, that the words are both "alien from the context," and "in themselves incoherent, and betraying another hand than the apostle's."

In answer to Dean Alford, who is cautious enough in his critical conclusions, as we all know, this "Boston Review" quotes the testimonies of Tertullian, Cyprian, Phebadius, Marcus Celedensis, Fulgentius, the African creed, and the Greek and Roman liturgies. These remarkable testimonies are to set aside the consenting voice of all the versions and manuscripts, the wise conclusions of the best and latest students of the Scripture. The witness of Eusebius he most confidently spurns; for was not Eusebius favorable to the Arians, and so "capable of corrupting the text" by leaving out this passage? And, if he was capable of doing it, is it not probable that he did it? And, if we consider his character, is there not

violent presumption" that he did let 1 John v. 7 "drop out of his revision"? And, if he did it, how can it but be that he did it designedly, "and for a sinister purpose"? And if he did it for one copy, of course he did it for fifty copies which he had the privilege and the command to prepare!

Eusebius, then, according to this complacent critic (or rather, may we not say, this biblical jester), is the scapegoat who must bear the sin of misleading all the interpreters, and hindering the orthodox reading of the inspired Epistle. The Arian Eusebius is the thief who stole from the Sacred Word this momentous text. Of course, as Eusebius wrote before the earliest of the manuscripts, they all took their cue from him. Why should "Bishop Bloomfield" wait for any more evidence about the passage? Why should he not "in his next edition take this reasoning, and agree with the old English interpreters against the 'host of German critics'?" asks our pleasant Reviewer. It will be news to most readers that the sagacious Bloomfield, whose value as a critic is so emphatically set forth by Dr. Tregelles in his critical remarks, has been made a "bishop." And there is something comical in mentioning a "new edition" of that never influential work, as if it could have authority with scholars. The opinions of Bloomfield are, among biblical scholars, what the poems of Tupper are in English literature. But even a Bloomfield cannot, in the middle of the nineteenth century, accept positively the text of the "Three Heavenly Witnesses." He will wait for more evidence; but he cannot say that the misunderstood references of four African fathers shall decide the question that all the manuscripts and versions and ordinary sources of biblical knowledge are false and defective. We doubt if the new light from Boston will set Bloomfield right.

In regard to the passages in Acts xx. 28, and 1 Tim. iii. 16, which are associated with the more famous passage from 1 John in this new critical discussion, there is some, though not much, room for question as to the true reading. There are some respectable authorities for the "received text." But this cannot be said of the "interpolation" in John's Epistle. Nothing but dogmatic prejudice can uphold what there is absolutely no critical reason for upholding. It is a shame to New-England scholarship that a Review of such standing as the "Boston Review" should admit such a travesty of all learning and sense as this extraordinary plea. The fact that the counter-opinions of Alford, Tregelles, and Tischendorf, are given by the editors at the close of the article, does not relieve it of its offensive character. The editors say that the *question is yet open*, and that "evidently the time has not yet come to close the case." But this question is no more open than the question whether Judith, or Bel and the Dragon, or the story of the chaste Susanna, belong to the Biblical Canon. Would they admit in their pages a defence of the canonical authority of these productions? Yet these have far more evidence in their favor than the text of the "Three Heavenly Witnesses." There is more evidence to show that the Epistle of Clement or the Shepherd Hermas is an inspired writing, and part of the New Testament, than there is to sustain this passage. It is pitiful that the interests of Orthodoxy should allow such trifling with scholarship and with facts.

CHANNING AND RENAN.

In the interesting volume of "Critical Essays," translated by Mr. Frothingham (the book noticed in our last number), there is an article on Channing, attractive to us for many reasons. It is well written, kindly in its tone, appreciative, in most respects, of Dr. Channing's great qualities, but full of frank dissent from many of his views, and criticism of his intellect. We propose to make a study of this study of Channing.

M. Renan has much to say in praise of our great American. Channing's name, he says, excites much sympathy and admiration in France. "A sudden fascination has attracted a number of choice spirits in England and France to his writings." Mr. Laboulaye's essays in the "Journal des Debats" "had called attention to his name, and animated enlightened minds with the desire to know more intimately the master whose renown fills all America." Channing is an "illustrious reformer:" "if not the founder, he is certainly the saint, of the Unitarians." He was "virtuous and right-minded;" "preserved all his life the energy of his moral convictions." "He meditated early and with much force all questions of social, moral, political order." "His real originality lies in his idea of a pure Christianity, disengaged from all sectarian bonds, and his abhorrence of all spiritual despotism." "He had a free and lofty tolerance:" "an indefatigable optimism was the whole of his religion." "His honesty amounts almost to genius." "His morality may be praised without reserve: it is, for us, original and new." There is nothing else in our time "that suggests these beautiful and noble moral discourses." "Never did man believe more firmly in progress." "He acknowledges no nobility but that of

virtue and work." "His ideas, inapplicable in France, seem to us to have in America an immense future." "If the problem of the universe could be resolved by rectitude of heart, simplicity, moderation of mind, Channing would have resolved it."

So much does M. Renan say in praise of Channing. Now for the reverse.

He is deficient "in that mental refinement which comes from contact with an aristocracy of intellect." "In speculation, he never went beyond the Scotch school;" he only "half understood Germany;" he "did not understand Europe, nor try to understand it." "His writings do not exhibit the smallest pretension to art or style." "He lacks information: his historical knowledge is all at second or third hand." "He has not that delicate feeling for shades of thought, which we call criticism." "He also lacks high originality of sentiment." He does not go far enough in his Protestantism: he stops half way, in the supernatural and miracles, which is "his narrow and contradictory side." "He never reached a perfectly clear statement of his own thought:" "he stopped far short of pure criticism." He is too minute in his discussion of texts of Scripture. In short, he lacks what America has hitherto lacked, — "high intellectual culture, critical knowledge." "In politics, he had little penetration." The social order he desired would be, if realized, "a good and happy people, but not a great one." "People would die of weariness there, genius would be useless, great art impossible."

In sum, M. Renan thinks that the moral element was stronger in Channing than the intellectual; that his mind did not have a high culture, or large reach, or sharp insight. He was a good man, but not a man of genius.

We shall not take the trouble to contradict this judgment: let it stand for what it is worth. But we wish to examine a little more precisely one or two of the special points made by M. Renan in opposition to Dr. Channing's supernaturalism. If we are not mistaken, they show a deficiency of the critical element in the *critic* rather than in the writer criticised.

M. Renan argues, that, to admit the supernatural element *at all*, requires that we should admit it to the full extent claimed by the Catholic Church. He says, that to admit the resurrection of Christ, and to deny his divinity (Deity), is illogical. He says that Channing "displays all the captiousness of a scholastic in establishing against the Trinitarians the sense in which Christ is the Son of God, and the sense in which he is not." M. Renan then adds, "Now, if we grant that he had a real and miraculous divinity from first to last, why not frankly call him divine?" (meaning, why not call him God?) The one demands no greater effort of faith than the other. There is no use in haggling over the supernatural," &c.

Well, what, then, *is* criticism? We had supposed that it consisted in doing this very thing which Channing does. It is in making distinctions; *not* taking things in a lump; admitting this, and refusing to admit that. Why object to Channing that he has no criticism, — "that delicate feeling for shades of thought that we call criticism," — and then object to him because he *does* distinguish between what to M. Renan seem only "shades of thought"?

Dr. Channing admits miracles, but does not admit *all* miracles. He believes in the resurrection, but not in the Trinity. Whereupon M. Renan cries out, "It is only the first step which costs!" If you admit any thing, take all. But this is what the atheist will say to M. Renan: "Why accept God, M. Renan, and yet take pains to deny

a miracle? Is not God a supernatural being? You have taken the first step in believing in any religion: why not go on, and believe the whole?"

M. Renan's argument would be just as good against any positive faith which was not also a superlative one. Why believe astronomy, if you deny astrology? Why believe chemistry, and disbelieve alchemy? Why believe in the immortality of the soul, and deny spirit-rapping? Why believe in peace, and not in non-resistance? Why believe in Christianity, and not in Mormonism? The answer is in all cases the same: Because it is our duty to be critical; i.e., to judge between each separate claim to our belief. Suppose that naturalists should say that no trees had been found more than two hundred and fifty feet, or three hundred feet, high. I measure a tree in California, and declare it to be four hundred feet high. Whereupon M. Renan says, in the interests of science, "If you believe *that*, you may as well believe it a mile high. It is only the first step which costs."

Renan objects to Channing, that, though "he preaches the most entire liberty of belief, he yet stops very far short of pure criticism." That is to say, he believes in a supernatural revelation. Does "pure criticism," then, consist in the result reached, and not in the method pursued? If Channing, in the exercise of free thought, deems a supernatural revelation the best explanation of the phenomena of Christianity, why is not that as much "pure criticism" as the opposite conclusion? M. Renan seems to say, "If, by your criticism, you come to the same results that I do, your critical method is right; otherwise it is defective."

Renan goes on to say, "If we grant the fact of a revelation made at a particular moment in history; if we grant truths divinely manifested, and consequently binding on

the conscience of him who thinks them revealed, — where is the difficulty of recognizing an outward establishment, a church teaching by supernatural illumination? It is neither easier nor harder to accept a miracle wrought eighteen hundred years ago than a miracle which is perpetuated in our own generation."

Perhaps not; but the question is not of hard and easy, but of true and false. We had never supposed that the argument against the claims of Rome was that they were *hard* to believe. We supposed that the objection to them was, that they were not supported by evidence. Renan seems to assert, that, if we find it "easy" to believe in the Roman Church, we may properly believe it. Now, there are multitudes of persons, with a taste for ceremony, ritual, sentimental religion, who love awful rites and solemn forms, who find it very easy indeed to believe in Romanism. Therefore, says M. Renan, they ought to do so.

Our author goes on thus: "Channing never saw quite clearly that the distant, if you please, but inevitable consequence, of admitting a revelation, is the admission of an authority to interpret it; the admission, in other words, of Catholicism." No: he did not see it; neither do we. God reveals himself in Nature. Do we need a scientific church to teach us by some inspired authority what is the interpretation? No: the reason of every man is the true interpreter of Nature, and not any close corporation of scholastics, pretending to teach science by an inward illumination.

God reveals himself in Christ and in the Bible just as he does in Nature. When we find what he says, we are bound to believe it in either case. In either case, our reason is the true interpreter of Nature and of Scripture.

M. Renan does not see, that, after you have your author-

itative church to explain revelation, you have not reached the end. Who is to make me sure that I understand correctly its explanation? God inspires Christ to make a revelation. Then, say the Catholics, he inspires our church to explain the revelation. But then he must inspire some one else to explain to me whether my understanding of the explanation is sound; and so on *ad infinitum*.

Christ promised the Holy Spirit to all his disciples, to lead them into all truth; to take of his, and show it to them. That is all the interpreter we need. That is enough. That, Dr. Channing believed and accepted. This gives, at last, the only certainty that any one can have.

We object, then, to our critic, that he is not critical enough. He makes religious belief a matter of taste. He says, "For my part, I would rather accept the authority of the Church than that of the Bible. The Church is more human, more living," &c. The point, however, is not what we had rather do, but what truth requires of us to do. Renan continues, and will continue for ever, a Frenchman. He judges by a certain feminine feeling, not by a manly judgment. He likes a thing; therefore it is true. He dislikes it, and so it is false.

MINISTERS FOR THE WEST.

Dear A., — It was with no surprise that I learned how discouraged you have become in the old and decaying parish where you have been at work for several years. Few pastors can resist the depressing influences of a neighborhood which loses almost all its young men as soon as they get old enough to engage in business for them-

selves; and I do not wonder at your desire to follow the enterprising portion of your flock to "fresh fields, and pastures ever new." At your age, and with your unwasted vigor, you cannot be expected to like the task of a man of science in Europe, who became melancholy and visionary towards the close of life, devoting himself to the occult sciences, and seeking to obtain from the bones and dust of the sepulchre the means of prolonging life. As it was said of an ancient philosopher, "Such a plant deserves a better soil." Therefore I am glad to see that you have adopted for your motto this fine passage from one of the letters of De Tocqueville: "I know not what will happen to me; but I feel certain I am more likely to start for China, to enlist as a soldier, or to risk my life in any hazardous, imprudent undertaking, than to condemn myself to the existence of a potato, like the good people whom I have just been with."

Let me warn you, however, at the very outset, that, unless you have counted the cost of this great change that you propose to make, it is best for you to stay at home. The West is no sphere for Mr. Faint-heart or Mr. Take-it-easily. Scores of men have gone out there as enthusiastic as you now appear to be; but zeal needs to be rooted in persistent courage, if it is not to wither away. If you could look over the piles of correspondence at the Unitarian rooms, the numerous letters of indignation dated in Illinois, Wisconsin, Ohio, &c., would remind you of Athanasius's story, told at the expense of death-bed baptisms: "An angel once said to my great predecessor, 'Why do you send me these sacks (those wind-bags), carefully sealed up, with nothing whatever inside?'"

Of course, you are to make some sacrifices; but do not magnify them needlessly. Literary society will not be so accessible. You will not be able to call upon Longfellow

and Lowell every now and then; and Concord will be too far off for even an occasional chat with Mr. Emerson in his own study. But perhaps you have been a trifle too free in these visits; and the poets, and the philosopher who is also a poet, will like you better than ever, when you are beheld a great way off. They are said to have taken quite a fancy to this little passage in Steffens's "Story of My Career:" "I was not one of those young men who have the boldness to crowd themselves without any reserve upon distinguished scholars. To visit Goethe in Weimar did not occur to me, interesting as it would have been to have approached him." Still, you can take their writings with you, and so commune with their spirits without the slightest risk of wearying their bodies, or helping to spoil a day for them after the style of a ruined one that Theodore Parker wails over in a letter to some friend.

Whenever you get perplexed or worried by parish cares, it will be impossible for you to pour your sorrows into the ears of wise and venerable fathers in Israel, according to the customs of the past; but have you never found yourself encumbered with advice which you could neither accept nor reject, without getting into trouble? Your new position will be at the least a great gain in independence; and with independence will come individuality, which is so nearly obscured in the vicinity of overshadowing reputations.

> "Ground in yonder social mill,
> We rub each other's angles down,
> And merge in form and gloss
> The picturesque of man and man."

Remember the bishop, who, having sought in vain to imitate the style of a more popular diocesan, had to confess at last, "I had almost marred my own natural trot by endeavoring to imitate his artificial amble."

Here in the East, every likely young man is in more or less danger of being called to a great pulpit, where the salary is three or five thousand dollars a year. If, with the most unworldly motives, he accepts the invitation, his old people quote for his benefit the striking text, "He that maketh haste to be rich shall not be innocent;" and for the benefit of his new charge, "Thou shalt not steal." Nobody will suspect you of going West from mercenary considerations. I know one of our faithful ministers out there who has never had a salary of more than three hundred and fifty dollars, and another whose maximum has been four hundred. Probably it will never be said of either of them or of you as Bonaparte said of one of his ministers: "He was so inordinately greedy of money, that he could not even write the word 'millions' without a kind of nervous agitation, and fidgeting in his chair."

You must prepare yourself for preaching in some rather queer places. Pioneer ministers often find themselves shorn of the ordinary surroundings that suggest devotion. Before you have a church, you will be lucky if your society does not occupy a succession of halls, "procured for the temporary residence of the Deity," if I may be permitted to use the expressive language of the rector of the Church of the Advent, in Boston. If the halls are used in the week as commercial colleges, you will see sums left on the blackboards; and the trained eyes of every merchant will mount each column of figures as naturally as squirrels would ascend so many trees. Sometimes, too, the halls will be in the third story; and the stairs will be so steep as to test the lungs of bulky persons. In Sparta, to be fat was an offence punishable at law; but there is no such ordinance of leanness in the West: and I know a minister who saw a portly parishioner stopping to pant it out at the head of the second flight of stairs, just

as the lesson for the day, from the one hundred and fiftieth Psalm, concluded with the unfortunate words, "Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord."

Other trials of your gravity will be furnished by the singing. But musical luxuries often have their price; and I have noticed, that, in some churches where costly choirs provide artistic performances, there is a virtual sacrifice of all freedom of the pulpit, lest the men who pay the large bills should hear something disrespectful to Mammon. I would rather have excruciating vocalisms where the word of God is not bound, than to supply the desired dumbness concerning fashionable sins, however melodious might be the strains of my fellow-serfs at the other end of the sanctuary. The Tyrrhenians caused their slaves to be flogged to the sound of the flute; but a rod is one of the things that can never be sweetened.

It is very well that you are paying considerable attention to controversial theology; for it will be a part of your work to defend the faith once delivered to the saints. But be in no haste to assume the aggressive. Among the Greeks, sometimes the child's first bed was a shield; and not a few Western societies have been cradled in controversy. There is no invariable rule; and any course, however pacific, will be justified, if it results in success. Centuries ago, a famous military leader said, "The object of a general is, not to fight, but to conquer: he fights enough who obtains the victory."

With all your indoctrinating pains, you will meet with some adherents almost utterly indifferent to technical theology. In the West, there are earnest and true men to be depended on as helpers in every humane work; but, if they are to be classified according to belief, it must be with a Swedish poet and historian, who said, "I am not a church Christian; I am not a Bible Christian: I am, so to speak,

a Christian on my own account." One of these persons told a friend of mine with bluntest integrity, "If you think I believe half that you preach, you overrate my credulity. I come to your meeting because I hear less that shocks my common sense than at other places of the kind." Yet this man proved quite a desirable ally.

Be sure to identify yourself with the people, so that they may regard you as bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh. "To conquer the Arab, you must first become an Arab," is a maxim with endless applications; and this is one of them. Unless you can see much to honor and love in the West, I advise you to keep away from it; for there is a reasonable demand of sympathy with the popular admiration of Western soldiers, and the general appreciation of Western rivers and fields. Indulge in unfavorable comparisons with things at the East, betray that you consider yourself an unhappy exile, and you are doomed; but throw your heart into their interests and plans, and you will find them as cordial, as generous, and as devoted a people as can be found on the face of the earth.

Above all, I charge you never to forget, that, as the representative of Liberal Christianity in a region where it is feeble and misunderstood, you have its reputation peculiarly in your own keeping. The tree will be judged by the fruit of your spirit and daily life. If your character does not commend your doctrines, your doctrines will be cast out, and trodden under foot of men. In that conspicuous sphere, the slightest moral defection will be "as when a standard-bearer fainteth." If you fall, it will be "never to rise again." Your fate will revive the memory of the slab called the Pillar of Infamy, kept by the Greeks in a cavern in the rock of the Acropolis; and on it were engraved the names of traitors and other public delinquents. If I had the slightest doubt of your uprightness, I would

not encourage your going to the West, although you might possess the finest elocution and the most pleasing address that can be imagined or desired. I like you, and trust you, first and chiefly, because I know that your whole soul responds to these best words of Thackeray: "We may not win the bâtons or epaulettes; but God give us strength to guard the honor of the flag!"

Go forth in this spirit, my young friend and brother, and your labor will not be in vain in the Lord. When I think of the warm greetings from veteran ministers in the West which await you, and your own pure and indomitable purpose, I yield to the conviction, that with continued health, and the blessing of God, you will do a noble and lasting work in the grand field that you are entering. As Carlyle wrote to Goethe of his Dumfries home, "The roses indeed are still, in fact, to be planted; but they blossom already in anticipation."

Give my love to all the brethren whom you will meet at the Western Conference. They are serving the best interests of our cause by their missionary efforts. "The fulness of the stream is the glory of the fountain; and it is because the Ganges is not lost among its native hills, but deepens and widens until it reaches the ocean, that so many pilgrimages are made to its springs." *

INDIA MISSION.

Unitarian Mission-House,
No. 85, Dhurmtollah Street, Calcutta, March 22, 1864.

To the Chairman of the A. U. A. Committee for India.

Dear Brother Winkley, — Our printing-press has arrived, after a hundred and fifty-six days on the sea. I presume it will open all in good order. It certainly marks an era in the life of our mission. . . . If we can once get

the press into working order, we can throw off a good deal of valuable material for distribution through the country. As the "Alabama" was reported prowling about the mouth of the bay, and actually burnt several ships off Singapore, we account ourselves fortunate to have received our type-preacher safe and sound.

I have been pretty busy lecturing in different places during the last four months, and happily "by request" in every instance. Two brother missionaries of sects not theologically, though perhaps ethically, Unitarian, have repeatedly called me to public speaking, as their helper in the Temperance reform. Eight or ten addresses and lectures, some of them carefully written, have thus found audience; and, in three instances, Hindoo men of progress have asked to print them at their own cost. In my daily addresses to an audience of about two hundred and twenty-five, on the radical principles of sound morals and gospel faith, something that our dear Lord Jesus said or did is always heard. Among my senior class of young men, who are part of my every-day hearers, I occasionally hear or see some half-hidden expression of dissent. It sometimes amounts to impatience, uttered perhaps in an ironical sigh, which is but too audible through the hall. I try to be very patient with it, and to overcome it with good; and it is often "given me in the same hour what I shall speak." I had rather have dissent than indifference. The audience of three or four hundred which I meet every Wednesday at the north end of Calcutta, at the "Training Academy," seems to be increasingly interested in the reception of our good things. A pleasant proof of this met me last week, in the purchase by some of their pupils, each with his own pocket-money, of twelve packets of our Boston Sunday-school Hymn and Scripture Cards, — twenty-five, as you remember, in a pack. These were young people of good families, and, of course, bought these tickets for distribu-

tion. The head-teacher was at first a little timid, and fearful of losing pupils if he distributed the Scripture-cards in the school himself. The brighter boys, however, had caught the "sacred fire," and seem nowise inclined to let it go out. On the contrary, they are beginning to make the sparks fly east and west. In looking carefully, before my last week's visit, over a quarter of a hundred cards, the principal found only four cards that he was not willing to distribute with his own hand in school-hours. If our friends are curious to know what in these four he found that staggered him, let me say, that he had not the least objection to such as contained the name and precepts of Jesus, or extracts from any part of the Bible, — not at all; it was only those which seemed to assume as proved, doctrines which his boys had had no chance to examine: yet such as declared Jesus to be "*the Saviour*," or that God "*for Christ's sake*" had forgiven our sins, he was glad to have his pupils learn, and teach even among the dear bigots in the *Zenaria* such purely Christian sentiments as —

"Who's the darling little girl
Even Jesus Christ can love?
She it is, who, meek and good,
Daily grows like him above."

Or, —

"I want to be like Jesus."

. . . . . .

"Alas! I'm not like Jesus,
As any one may see."

But he, as I said, threw out *four* from the packet of twenty-five, one of which reads, —

"'Let them come,'
Said the gentle, loving *Saviour*."

Another, —

"O gentle *Saviour!* send thy grace."

Another, — "Forgive one another, as God, "*for Christ's*

sake, hath forgiven you;" and the fourth, — the Ten Commandments in metre, — of which the second reads, —

"Before no idol bend the knee."

And the fourth, —

"Nor dare the sabbath day profane."

The Hindoos, as you know, have their religious festivals at irregular intervals of time, from two to six weeks apart, but religiously observe no sabbath nor Sunday nor seventh portion of time, like the Jews, Mahometans, and Christians.

Last Sunday, I had — let me see — some five or six interviews with — I can hardly call them classes, of from one to three or four persons each, extending from dawn to dark; though I have at present no properly public service, unless my small liturgic Sunday-school service from eleven to twelve and a half each Sunday noon may be considered public. There is a fine English Unitarian family, the M——s, whose "conversation is in heaven," and whose children say their hymns to me every Sunday morning at their own home about sunrise. Returning from that walk last Sunday, I found awaiting me at the mission-house three young men, with whom I conversed on the gospel-life till breakfast-time. These took away something to read. My Sunday school was my third meeting. I omitted to mention a daylight-talk with my Doeg boys at the Martinière bathing-rooms, about one and a half miles south of our place. Fourth was a brief meeting in a garden, with a circle of Roman Catholics, Europeans, who are my neighbors, and where there are seven or eight children. Then, towards evening, came one or two Bible-class students for two hours, to be strongly moved (as strongly as Hindoo natures may be) by the agony of Jesus in Gethsemane. At the Union Chapel in the evening, I again met, religiously, with friends. So roll on the week-days and the Sundays of your favored brother DALL.

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

May 9, 1864. — Present, Messrs. Stebbins, Kidder, Hedge, Clarke, Brigham, Newell, Barrett, Hinckley, Winkley, Ware, Eliot, Sawyer, and Fox.

The India-Mission Committee reported in favor of paying the marine insurance on Mr. Dall's printing-press, in compliance with the request contained in a recent letter from him; and their report was adopted.

The Committee on New-England Correspondence reported that a very satisfactory reply had been received to the letter they were instructed at the last meeting to write to Houlton, Me.; and, in accordance with their recommendation, an appropriation of $100 was made to the society in that place, to aid them in sustaining preaching.

The Committee on Western Correspondence presented a letter from Rev. John S. Brown, of Lawrence, Kan., asking that a minister might be sent to take his place as pastor of the society there, which position he was obliged to relinquish; and the Committee were authorized to send a suitable person to Lawrence, and pay his travelling expenses from the funds of the Association.

This Committee presented a letter from Rev. Silas Farrington, giving an interesting account of his experiences at Janesville, and representing the movement there as likely to prove a decided success; also a letter from Rev. C. A. Staples, concerning missionary work at the West; and then, in compliance with the wish of the Board, Dr. Eliot gave his views on this subject.

The Army-Mission Committee reported that Mr. Mellen had been engaged to visit again the Camp of Distribution; and would leave for Alexandria the next day, with a large supply of reading-matter for the soldiers.

Mr. Clarke called the attention of the Board to the case of Charles B. Thomas, who had recently been dismissed

from his society in Chicago for immoral conduct; and requested Dr. Eliot, who had just come from there, to make a statement in regard to the matter.

Dr. Eliot said that he believed the account given in the Chicago papers to be correct; and that he had been requested by the friends of the lady, and by the society, to take such steps as might be necessary to expose Mr. Thomas, and thus prevent his continuing longer in the Christian ministry. He then read the following sent to him by the secretary of the society: —

"At a meeting of the Trustees of the First Unitarian Society of Chicago, held at the Church of the Messiah, April 17, 1864, the following resolution was adopted; viz.: —

"*Resolved*, That Charles B. Thomas, who has been acting as pastor of the First Unitarian Society of Chicago, having violated the laws of God and society, and thereby become unworthy the name of a Christian man, therefore we, the trustees, in the name of said society, hereby declare his connection with said society dissolved.

"(Signed) MURRAY NELSON, A. C. BADGER, AMORY BIGELOW, } *Trustees.*

"At a full meeting of the society, held April 28, 1864, the above action of the trustees was unanimously confirmed.

"The above is a true statement taken from the records of the society. "FRED. P. FISHER,

"*Secretary of the First Unitarian Society, Chicago.*

"CHICAGO, May 2, 1864."

After some discussion, the subject was referred to a Committee, consisting of Messrs. Eliot and Clarke, with authority to publish such a statement as might seem to them best.

The President then read to the Board a communication received from Rev. S. G. Bulfinch, Chairman of the Committee on Ministerial Work of the Ministerial Union,

enclosing two resolutions, on the subject of a nearer connection of the churches of the denomination, adopted by the Union, and referred to the Committee for any further action. The letter suggested, that "one of the ways to a more perfect union among the churches would be the modification of the Association so as to make it a representative body."

Mr. Hinckley then presented for consideration an amendment to the By-laws of the Association, designed to effect the change suggested; which, after some discussion, was referred to a Committee, consisting of Messrs. Hedge, Hinckley, and Ware, to report upon at the next meeting.

After the transaction of other business, the Board adjourned to Monday, May 23.

May 23. — Present, Messrs. Stebbins, Newell, Barrett, Ware, Sawyer, and Fox.

The Treasurer presented his annual statement, duly audited by Messrs. C. H. Burrage and Thomas Gaffield, the gentlemen appointed for that purpose by the President, in accordance with the vote adopted by the Association at the last annual meeting.

The Committee to whom was referred at the last meeting the subject of amending the By-laws of the Association, reported that it was inexpedient for the Board to take any action in the matter; which report was adopted.

The President was requested to state to the Association at the meeting the next day, that, in the opinion of the Board, the present system of having a layman for Secretary should be continued.

The Secretary then read the report prepared by him, which was adopted as the Annual Report of the Executive Committee, to be presented to the Association on the following day.

The Board then adjourned *sine die*.

INTELLIGENCE.

The Meetings of Anniversary Week occurred as usual. The American Unitarian Association celebrated its thirty-ninth anniversary at the Arlington-street Church on Tuesday, May 24. As a full report of this occasion will be published in the July number of this Journal, no account need be given of it here. The Festival took place at the Music Hall on Tuesday evening. Mayor Lincoln presided; and addresses were made by Rev. Octavius B. Frothingham, of New York; Charles Eliot Norton, Esq., of Cambridge; Rev. Frederic H. Hedge, D.D., of Brookline; Rev. William G. Eliot, D.D., of St. Louis; Rev. George H. Hepworth, and William Everett, Esq., of Boston; and Rev. William G. Scandlin, of Grafton. The great organ was played by Messrs. J. H. Paine, B. J. Lang, and W. E. Thayer. The Ministerial Conference met Wednesday forenoon, at the Arlington-street Vestry. An address was delivered by Rev. George E. Ellis, D.D., of Charlestown; which was followed by the usual discussion. The Sunday-School Society held their anniversary meeting on Wednesday evening, at the Hollis-street Church. Addresses were made by the President, Rev. Alfred P. Putnam, of Roxbury; Rev. William G. Eliot, D.D., of St. Louis; Rev. Samuel Osgood, D.D., of New York; and Rev. Carlton A. Staples, of Milwaukee, Wis. The Children's Mission celebrated their fifteenth anniversary on Thursday afternoon, at the Brattle-street Church. The annual reports of the secretary and treasurer were read; and remarks were made by the president, Hon. Albert Fearing, and Rev. Samuel K. Lothrop, D.D., of Boston; John Kneeland, Esq., of Roxbury; Rev. Samuel H. Winkley, of Boston; Rev. William G. Eliot, D.D., of St. Louis; Hon. John C. Park, of Roxbury; and Rev. Joseph E. Barry, the missionary of the society. The Lord's Supper was administered Thursday morning, at the Bedford-street Church, by Rev. William G. Eliot, D.D. Prayer and Conference Meetings were held, on each morning of the week, at the different churches, and were well attended.

The Conference of Western Unitarian Churches will meet at Meadville, Penn., on Wednesday, June 29, and con-

tinue through the following Sunday. The opening discourse will be delivered by Rev. Cyrus A. Bartol, D.D., of Boston.

The Visitation of the Meadville Theological School will take place on Thursday, June 30. Rev. Rufus P. Stebbins, D.D., the former president, has accepted an invitation to address the graduating class and the alumni of the school on the preceding evening.

The New-Hampshire Unitarian Association will hold their annual meeting at Nashua on Wednesday and Thursday, June 15 and 16.

The Maine Unitarian Conference will hold their annual meeting at Waterville, commencing on Tuesday evening, June 21, and continuing through the two following days.

Mr. Francis E. Abbot has accepted a call from the society in Dover, N.H.

Mr. David H. Montgomery has received a call from the society at Harrison Square, Mass.

Rev. Alfred P. Putnam, of Roxbury, Mass., has accepted a call from the First Unitarian Society, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Rev. James Thurston has resigned the charge of the society in Leicester, Mass.

Rev. Charles C. Shackford has resigned the charge of the society in Lynn, Mass.

Rev. William C. Tenney has resigned the charge of the society in Marlborough, Mass.

Rev. Artemas B. Muzzey has resigned the charge of the society in Newburyport. Mass., on account of ill health.

Rev. Seth Saltmarsh has resigned the charge of the society in Petersham, Mass.

Rev. James T. Hewes, of South Boston, has received a call from the Second Unitarian Society, Portland, Me.

Rev. Alpheus S. Nickerson has received a call from the Society in Sterling, Mass.

Meadville Theological School. — The Spring Term ends on June 30. The Fall Term begins Sept. 12. The Faculty of Instruction consists of Rev. A. A. Livermore, President; Professors, Rev. G. W. Hosmer, D.D., G. L. Cary, F. Huidekoper, A. D. Mayo, D. Millard, and tutor C. A. Allen. There is a

preparatory class for those who have not received a collegiate education. $70 a year is granted to beneficiaries. The tuition, library, and use of text-books, are free to all. At the time of graduation, $50 worth of books are given to each one receiving the diploma of the school, whose circumstances require it. The school was founded by the Unitarian and Christian denomination, and has been in operation twenty years. The library consists of seven thousand eight hundred volumes. The object is to give a sound Christian education to students for the ministry.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Since our last Notice.

The Ferry-boy and the Financier. By a Contributor to the "Atlantic." Tenth thousand. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co., 245, Washington Street. 1864.

Spectacles for Young Eyes: Zurich. By SARAH W. LANDER. Third thousand. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co., 245, Washington Street. 1864.

Stories of the Patriarchs. By O. B. FROTHINGHAM. Twelve of the Old-Testament narratives. Walker, Wise, & Co. 1864.

These three books are each and all well suited for children and for Sunday-school libraries. We have no space nor time now to say any thing further, but recommend them to our friends.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1864.			
Apr. 26.	From	Miss Mary Glover, for Army Fund	$1.00
„ 27.	„	De Witt C. Bates, as an annual membership .	1.00
„ 28.	„	Society in Waltham, for Monthly Journals . .	33.00
„ „	„	Society in Pittsburg, Pa., as a donation . . .	5.00
„ „	„	Rev. G. L. Chaney, as an annual membership	1.00
„ 29.	„	Rev. A. Woodbury's Society, Providence, R.I., as a donation, additional	105.00
„ „	„	Mt. Pleasant Society, Roxbury, for Monthly Journals, additional	2.00
„ 30.	„	Society in South Boston, for Monthly Journals	24.00
„ „	„	Society in Baltimore, Md., for Monthly Journal, additional	1.00
„ „	„	Rev. Dr. Hall's Society, Providence, R.I., as a donation	301.06
May 4.	„	Society in Brattleborough, Vt., for Monthly Journals	12.00

May	4.	From	Mt. Pleasant Society, Roxbury, for Monthly Journal, additional		$1.00
"	6.	"	C. R., as a donation		5.00
"	"	"	C. R., for Army Fund		5.00
"	7.	"	Society in Keokuk, Io., as a donation		25.00
"	8.	"	Portsmouth, N.H., Monthly Journals	$20.00	
			Home Missions	10.00	
			India Mission	10.00	
			Army Fund	5.00	
					45.00
"	9.	"	Society in Buffalo, N.Y., as a donation, including life-membership of O. G. Steele	$150.00	
			For Monthly Journals	50.00	
					200.00
"	"	"	Rev. Dr. Robbins's Society, Boston, a donation		120.00
"	"	"	Society in Taunton, as a donation, including life-membership of Timothy Gordon		103.00
"	"	"	Rev. T. J. Mumford, as an annual membership		1.00
"	10.	"	Rev. A. S. Ryder, as an annual membership		1.00
"	11.	"	Friends in New Brunswick, N.J., as a donation		18.00
"	"	"	M. T. Rice, as an annual membership		1.00
"	14.	"	Society in Eastport, Me., as a donation		25.00
"	16.	"	Rev. C. D. Bradlee, as an annual membership		1.00
	"	"	Society in Manchester, N. H., for Monthly Journals		8.00
"	"	"	Society in Waltham, for Monthly Journal, additional		1.00
"	19.	"	Society in Sterling, as a donation		45.00
"	20.	"	Rev. A. Woodbury's Society, Providence, R.I., as a donation, additional (in all, $329.00)		24.00
"	21.	"	Society in Medfield, for India Mission		17.92
"	"	"	Rev. Ed. E. Hale's Society, Boston, a donation		360.00
"	"	"	Society in Cohasset, for Monthly Journals		12.00
"	23.	"	Society in Framingham, as a donation		55.50
"	"	"	Society in Walpole, N.H., as a donation		14.30
"	"	"	John Wilson, John Wilson, Jr., J. A. Shaw, and Rev. J. B. Green, as annual memberships		4.00
"	"	"	Rev. F. A. Farley, D.D., trustee, as income of Graham Fund		162.50
"	24.	"	Society in Lexington, as a donation		43.00
"	"	"	Rev. R. R. Shippen's Society, Worcester, as a donation		53.60
"	"	"	Society in Brunswick, Me., as a donation		15.00
"	"	"	Rev. G. W. Skinner, as an annual membership		1.00
"	25.	"	Friends, for Army Fund		2.00
"	"	"	Rev. Dr. Hill's Society, Worcester, a donation		128.00
"	"	"	Society in Belfast, Me., as a donation		52.00
"	"	"	Rev. J. L. Hatch, H. A. Bellows, Jared Bellows, Lewis Downing, jun., Onslow Stearns, and Gustavus Walker, Concord, N.H., as annual memberships		6.00
"	"	"	Society in Warwick, for Monthly Journals		8.00
"	"	"	Society in Sudbury, for Monthly Journals		3.00
"	27.	"	Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, Piety, and Charity, for the distribution of Army Tracts		63.00